

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/008,210 11/08/2001 Masaaki Iwasaki 21334-1089 2163 EXAMINER 7590 04/28/2004 Tyco Technology Resources VU, HIEN D Suite 450 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 4550 New Linden Hill Road Wilmington, DE 19808 2833

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)	1 1
			. ·	IWASAKI, MASAAKI	CI
Office Action Summary		Examine		Art Unit	
		Hien D. V	u	2833	
The M Period for Reply	AILING DATE of this commun	ication appears on the	e cover sheet with th	e correspondence addres	S
A SHORTEN THE MAILING - Extensions of tir after SIX (6) MC - If the period for - If NO period for - Failure to reply v Any reply receiv	ED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR DATE OF THIS COMMUNION of the may be available under the provisions NTHS from the mailing date of this common teply specified above is less than thirty (3 reply is specified above, the maximum standard in the set or extended period for reply ed by the Office later than three months arm adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ev nunication. 0) days, a reply within the stat atutory period will apply and w will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be utory minimum of thirty (30) ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS fo lication to become ABANDO	e tirnely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this commu DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.
Status					
1)⊠ Respor	nsive to communication(s) file	d on <u>29 December 2</u>	<u>003</u> .		
2a)⊠ This ac	tion is FINAL .	2b)∐ This action is r	on-final.		
-	his application is in condition in accordance with the practi	-			rits is
Disposition of C	laims				
4a) Of t 5) ☐ Claim(s 6) ☑ Claim(s 7) ☐ Claim(s	s) <u>19-30</u> is/are pending in the he above claim(s) is/as is/are allowed. s) is/are rejected. s) is/are objected to. s) are subject to restrict	re withdrawn from co			
Application Pap	ers				
9)∐ The spe	cification is objected to by the	e Examiner.			
10)∐ The dra	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
	nt may not request that any obje	• .	·	• •	
	ment drawing sheet(s) including				
11)∐ The oat	h or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner. N	ote the attached Off	ice Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	ledgment is made of a claim b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internation attached detailed Office action	documents have bee documents have bee of the priority documental nal Bureau (PCT Rul	en received. en received in Applic ents have been rece e 17.2(a)).	eation No sived in this National Staç	ge
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of Refer	rences Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ	ary (PTO-413)	
2) 🔲 Notice of Drafts	sperson's Patent Drawing Review (P colosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		Paper No(s)/Mai)

Application/Control Number: 10/008,210

Art Unit: 2833

1. Claims 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 19, lines 4-6, it is unclear how the bent portion could flex to allow the housing to move along a surface of the circuit board.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (5,540,598) in view of French (963) and Johnescu et al.

Insofar as the claims can be understood, Davis, French and Johnescu are applied as follows: Davis, Figs. 1-2 show an insulating housing 2, a plurality of contacts 20 each having contact portion for electrically connecting with mating contacts, a contact section (22, 36) having a bent portion which flexes to allow the housing to move along a surface of a circuit board 23, an alignment plate 28 having guide holes 31 and positioning posts 18. Davis does not show the positioning posts having ribs. Johnescu, Figs. 2B & 2C show positioning post 156 having ribs 158. It would have been obvious an obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Davis by providing the positioning posts with ribs, as taught by Johnescu, in order to secure the connector to the circuit board.

Application/Control Number: 10/008,210

Art Unit: 2833

As to claim 20, the bent portion 22 is arranged at an intermediate point along the length of the contact.

As to claims 21-23 a first set of contacts having a bent portion 36 larger than he bent portion 22 of a second set6 of contacts.

As to claim 25, Davis does not show the metal attachment 14 having features as described in claim 25. French (963), Fig. 1 show a metal attachment having features as described in claim 25. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Davis by replacing the metal attachment with a metal attachment having features as described in claim 25, as taught by French, in order to provide better securing to the circuit board.

As to claim 26, the ribs 158 extend parallel to the posts.

As to claim 27, the posts extend further toward the circuit board than the contact sections.

As to claim 29, it would have been obvious to modify the guiding holes of Davis to have a shape of converges, as taught by Johnescu, in fig. 2C, in order to guide the contact sections.

As to claim 30, it would have been obvious to provide the alignment of Davis plate with latch arms, as taught by Johnescu in figs. 2A-2b, in order to secure the plate to the housing.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-30 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/008,210

Art Unit: 2833

Page 4

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in

37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D Vu at telephone number (571) 272-2016.

HIENVU PRIMARY EXAMINER